

Remarks

Claims 1, 5, 7, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thueringer et al. (US 6498404). Claims 9-11 and 12 are cancelled.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. With respect to Claim 1, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to “break the load circuit of Thueringer into multiple other components” because “[t]his would make the interchangeability of parts easier”. However, Thueringer teaches away from this concept: “[p]referably, the load circuit and the data processing device are integrated in a common circuit” (col. 1, lines 66-67) for security reasons (col. 2, lines 1-4). To do what the Examiner suggests would make the circuits more vulnerable to the attacks discussed by Thueringer (see col. 1, lines 19-22). Clearly, the Examiner’s appeal to MPEP 2144.04 (V)(B) is misplaced.

Furthermore, Claim 1 as amended requires that “the activity monitor circuit is coupled to receive a pair of processing signals for each of the processing circuits, coming into and out of the processing circuit respectively, the activity monitor circuit being configured to derive the activity information from each pair of processing signals and to derive from the activity information for said processing circuits a combined activity signal dependent on the processing signals indicative of a sum of power supply currents that will be consumed by said processing circuits in combination” (emphasis added) (see also page 2, lines 30-34, page 3, lines 1-3 of the application as originally filed). However, Thueringer et al. only teach generating cloaking currents for each logic circuit separately (cf. col. 3, line 14). Hence, Claim 1 as amended is patentable over Thueringer et al. Claims 2-6 and 13-14 depend from Claim 1 as amended and are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 as amended.

Similarly to Claim 1, Claim 7 as amended recites “deriving from the activity information a combined activity signal indicative of a sum of power supply currents that will be consumed by all of the processing circuits in combination dependent on the processing signals”. Hence, Claim 7 as amended is patentable over Thueringer et al. Claim 8 depends from Claim 7 as amended and is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 7 as amended.

Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Senior Corporate IP Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

By: /j krause-polstorff/
Juergen Krause-Polstorff
Reg. No.: 41,127
(408) 474-9062

CUSTOMER NO. 65913